Vol. XVII. No. 11. | November 1921. | Whole No. 197.

19 JUL 19

ॐ

The Jaina Gazette.

A little learning is a dangerous thing;
Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring;
Their shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
And drinking largely sobers us again.

—*Pope.*

THE JAINAS OF INDIA

AND

DR. H. S. GOUR'S "*Hindu Code.*"

THE Jainas are a most ancient people in the world. Even limping and hesitating unhistorical Indian history sees them flourishing as a very important sect in India in the sixth century B. C., and at least a few centuries before then. There is no doubt at all now according to up-to-date research in Indian History and Religion that Lord Mahavira (traditionally 599—527 B. C.) was not the originator or founder of the great systom of thought and religion called Jainism. He was merely a follower of a more ancient faith, the leaders of which were called *Nirgranthas*, and were formidable rivals of their contemporaries, the *Ajivakas* &c. Buddhism was later than this creed of *Nirgranthas* or *Nigganthas*, as they are called in the *Prakrit* of the Buddhist sacred books. These Nirgranthas centred round a teacher, Lord Parsvanath, whose historicity is beyond question, and after whom the

great and beautiful range of mountains in Hazaribag in Behar is called. The pupils of this great Teacher are mentioned as having had religious discussions with the Buddha himself, thus confirming the Jaina tradition that Lord Parsvanath was the twenty-third Jaina Tirthankara. He was preceded at a distance of many centuries by Lord Neminath in Kathiavad, who belonged to the Yadava clan of the Kshatriyas and was a cousin of the great-souled Krishna, who is worshipped by our Hindu brethren. Thus History, profane and sacred, of Hindus, Jainas and Buddhists confirms the antiquity of Jainism to a considerably earlier period than about 1000 B. C. Hindu holy book—the *Bhagvata Purana* mentions a Rishabha ascetic, who was pure and renowned. This Rishabha is the first Lord Rishabha Nath of Jaina holy tradition. He flourished in Ajodhya a long time ago. Dr. Buhler also found at Muthra old remains containing inscriptions of many dedications to this same Lord Rishabha as the founder of Jainism. The Jainas are thus a very old people. Indeed it is only when we recede into the vagueness of tradition, even legend and prehistoric myth that we lose the firm thread of Jaina history. There is nothing in all the orthodox sources and methods of ancient Indian History which would negative the main and chief outlines of Jaina tradition.

Jainism stands apart from all other religions of the world, by its most clearcut and definite theology and metaphysics. There is nothing dark, obscure, or arbitrary in its great doctrine. It is clearness itself. Its logic is invincible. Its necessity is irresistible, only if we free ourselves from the thraldom of passion, prejudice, and worldly compromise with ignorance and materialism. The great and magnificent mosaic of Hinduism with its six main and many minor systems of philosophy presents a tempting contrast. The perspicacity of Jainism, to a hostile critic, may read like a protest against the endless multiplicity of Hinduism. A few doctrines are most clearly different in the two, and stamp them as irreconcilably distinct creeds. One of them is the idea of God. Hinduism takes God as tke creator (Brahma) of the Universe. Jainism takes Him as the Ideal and Perfect soul, the *summum bonum* of all that is. Another is that Jainism puts *ahimsa* on a more absolute and higher pedestal than Hinduism. There are more; but the above two are sufficiently illustrative of my thesis.

Now it is natural and inevitable that a people with such history, tradition, and independent doctrine, should have, hold and

cherish Laws which must differ from the Laws of their Hindu brethren, who do not share their history, tradition and doctrine.

The world has marched on from sensation to sensation in such rapid succession during the last 20 years or so, that things of a decade ago loom like vanished ghosts of a long, long dead past. It is as if yesterday that after the red day of the Mutiny, India slept like a psychologised baby under the spell of British domination and the Jainas like other sections of the Indian nation had no consciousness of their rights, position, past or prospects. But it is pleasant to notice and emphasize that with every awakening or half awakening of India, the Jainas kept admirable pace. The nation had its Congress and Social and Educational Conferences, the Jainas at once had their All-India Digambara Jaina Mahasabha, Svetambar and Sthanakvasi Conferences, Boarding Houses, Schools, newspapers, memorials, etc. etc., the whole parapheranalia of modern so-called enlightenment and progress. Under Mahomedan monarchs and their *Qazis* (Judges), Jaina Pandits presumably helped the *Qazis* and a sort of tolerable justice was done to Jaina litigants. This system seemed to survive in the early days of the English *Diwani* (Civil Administration) in Behar and Bengal. A little less than a century ago we read of a *Vyavasthà* (or pronouncement) of the Jaina Pandits in a case See *Govinda Nath Ray* v. *Gulab Chand Golecha* (1833) 5 Sel. Rep. S. D. A., Cal. p. 276.

When the British became more established, their courts knew more of Hindu and Mahomedan laws than of Jaina Law. The lawyers also were seldom drawn from the Jainas. The natural result was that Jaina Law was ignored and only in some stray cases, special Jaina custom was alleged and proved. What a terrible thing this special custom is to prove, is only known to the weary lawyers and unfortunate litigants who have to allege and establish it! So in a few cases, here and there, this grand special custom of the Jainas walked forth majestically in costly, almost ruinous, robes; but for the rest Jaina law was ignored as if it was quite *non est.* This was a great injustice, and a cruel blow to the rights of Jainas. But who was to champion their cause? The Hindus held that they would go to be trampled by a mad elephant, rather than go to a Jaina temple for shelter! The Mahomedans and the British had no interest in a foreign religion. One party to every Jaina suit, in self-interest, was ready to swear that the

law of Hindu, or the English or that of Hammu Rabbi, for the matter of that, applied to him, provided it would help him to win his case as against Jaina Law, under which he would fail. Thus Jaina Law remained ignored and the heresy of the Jainas being "Hindu dissenters" went on being perpetuated at the cost of all religious and social susceptibilities of the Jainas. As I pointed above, the All-India Jaina Mahasabha came to be registered towards the end of the last century. In 1910, it appointed a Committee to go into the question of Jaina Law. This was in April 1910 in Sravana Belgola, in Mysore State. For various reasons it could not frame a code; but important work has been done since 1910. A great thing was achieved in 1916, by the publication, by that most lamented young worker for Jainism, Kumar Devendra Prasadji of Arrah, of *Jaina Law*, a translation with text and Introduction and Appendices of *Badrabahu Samhita*. This is the only book in English on Jaina Law and deals with almost all the mistakes about Jaina Law and Jainism prevalent in law-books and Judgments.

Dr. H. S. Gour M. L. A. is a lawyer of wonderful talents. In his *Hindu Code*, he has repeated some of the errors which found place in Law Reports and other Government publications. There is a proposal before the authorities for the codification of Hindu Law; and the opinions on it have been invited from Local Governments and High Courts. Naturally the Jainas are apprehensive that Dr. Gour will stand by his own *Hindu Code*, and his errors if passed into law by the Legislative Assembly, will render cruel, and irreparable injustice to Jainas and their rights. It is thus that Jainas all over India are pained and chagrined at this threat to their rights.

I reproduce some of the offending portions of Dr. Gour's book.

THE HINDU CODE.

Page 180.

296. The Jains are another sect of Hindu dissenters, who still remain Hindus and to whom the Hindu Law applies. The sect is now a well-known sub-division of the Vaishya caste, which is divided into Agarwalas, Mahesris and Jains, the two former being orthodox Hindus while the last being classed as Hindu heretics. They are again sub-divided into Digambaris and Sitambaris, the former worshipping their god stripped of all attire, while the

latter worship him clothed in costly raiments. The hostility between the two sects is as great as *theologicum odium* can reach.

Page 181.

297. The Jains differ from the Hindus not only in their tenets but in their practices in consequence. They perform no obsequies after the corpse is buried. They regard the birth of a son as having no effect on the future state of his progenitor, and consequently adoption is a merely temporal arrangement and has no spiritual object. The Jain widow has consequently an absolute right of adoption and requires no express or implied authority of her husband or his kinsmen. Her adoption is not controlled by the sacred texts. She may adopt her daughter's son and in fact any one and of any age in accordance with the usage of the sect.

Page 191.

331. Jainism claims to be the precursor of Buddhism, but it is only its child. It is in reality a compromise between Buddhism and Hinduism, an adaptation made by those who could not receive the new faith, but who nevertheless found refuge in a creed, which while retaining its traditional connection with Hinduism, has borrowed from Buddhism its doctrines and religious practice. In course of time as Buddhism lost its hold on India, its wanting influence continued in Jainism till it relapsed into a form of Hinduism into which its individuality became eventually merged and practically lost.

The very first section No. 296, contains no less than 8 misrepresentations; section 297, has 4; and section 331, again, has 8 mistakes. I deal with them *seriatim* below.

1. "The Jainas are another sect of Hindu dissenters."—This is a gross misrepresentation and an unmerited insult. It is as if you called the Mahomedans Christian dissenters or the Christians, Jewish dissenters. This mistake to me seems to have arisen thus. When the Jainas fell away from the strict faith, discipline and morality of Jainism, naturally they began to disintegrate. Their kingdoms became less in number and importance, till to-day there are only dim traditions of Jaina kings in Orissa and elsewhere. Still we get glimpses of old Jaina greatness in the fact that Jainas have the lowest number of criminals and paupers in India, and wherever they are found in big commercial towns or in remote villages, they are leading merchants, bankers and jewellers. Nor

is their education neglected. In Law, Judiciary, Executive, highest and lowest, Jainas are found everywhere as Lawyers, Judges, Doctors, Councillors, Administrators, Honorary and stipendiary officials, etc., etc. In the decline of Jainism and of the influence of Jainas, the Jaina community was cast in the shade by the overwhelming majority of their Hindu neighbours. Religious fanaticism also took its toll of the followers of the Jina. In the eighth century A. D., Buddhism lost its home of origin entirely, but Jainism managed to survive in a weak and secondary position. Nor are the Hindu persecutions of Jainas and Jainism in the extreme South of India unknown to students of Indian history.

The Jainas were naturally influenced by the customs, habits and traditions of their powerful and more numerous Hindu neighbours. The Europeans therefore mistook them to be a sect of Hindus; but as Jaina theology was ever irreconcilably and emphatically different from Hindu dogma, in a fit of lazy generalisation some one called them "Hindu dissenters." And this error lived on because Jainas were unorganised and there was no one to bring the error to light and champion the true cause of Jainism in India among ignorant Europeans and their Indian followers, or among the still more distant and ignorant European savants in Europe and England. Almost all great and authoritative ideas, theories, discoveries originated in Europe, specially in Germany. Now German scholars mostly read Hindu and Buddhist books. Their minds were charmed by the mysterious metaphysics and lofty speculations of these great systems. It was not till the eighties of the last century were fairly advanced that Dr. Herman Jacobi gave to Europe the first authoritative translation* in English of some ancient Jaina texts. He it was who first disentangled the mind of Orientalists from their confusion about Jainism and Buddhism, even to the extent of not understanding properly the merest elementary facts about the religion and great personages of Buddhism and Jainism—specially those of the latter. It took the great Dr. Jacobi himself about a quarter of a century to recognise the independence, and greatness of Jainism as a system of religion and metaphysics! It is the slow progress, towards real knowledge of scholars and their being followed blindly

* Acharanga Sutra, Volume XXII of Sacred Books of the East Series by H. Jacobi, Edited by Max Muller 1884.

though naturally by the Law Courts and legal writers which is responsible for the painful libel that Jainas are Hindu dissenters.

Indeed no critic of Jainism has ever averred, much less proved, how, when, why and where the Jainas rose up one morning and like an undutiful child told their Hindu Mamma: Matas, good morning, I am off. I am henceforth a Hindu dissenter.

In sober truth, this error, perhaps excusable in a foreigner is unforgiveably strange in an Indian of Dr. H. S. Gour's eminence.

2. "Who still remain Hindu."—This is another libel, a child of the last one. Why should Jainas still remain Hindus, if they dissent from Hinduism? Why should Hindus embrace Jainas as Hindus, after the Jainas dissent, from their common creed? Jainas are not Hindus, if by Hindus we mean people governed by Hindu Law.

The Secretary of the Jaina Mitra Mandal, Delhi has kindly brought to my notice parts of the controversy which is raging round this point. But I fear this is really a tempest in the teapot owing to selfish greed, fear and misrepresentation. The question is: Are Jainas Hindus? Let us first define words. Who is a Jaina and who a Hindu? A Jaina is a man who believes that the soul of man or any living being can, by proper training etc., become omniscient like the soul of the *Jina*, Conqueror of all passions; that the world consists of six eternal, uncreated, indestructible substances; and that the path to eternal freedom lies along the triple road of right belief, right knowledge and right action as disclosed in the Jaina sacred books, in accordance with the tradition of Lord Mahavira. This is the essential minimum. If a man falls short of this, whoever he may be, he is not a Jaina.

If a Hindu be defined as one born in India, or at the best one born in India and who was not a Mahomedan or Christian by birth then certainly every Jaina is a Hindu.—Some say *Hindu* is one from whom injury (*Him*-sa) is removed (*Du*-r). If this is so, only Jainas are the first and best Hindus; whereas meat eating, hunting Hindus will not be Hindus at all. Others say,—a Hindu is one who owes allegiance to the Vedas or the Brahman. There again Jainas are not Hindus.

Really it is an idle and futile problem. It all depends on what you mean by a Hindu. Let the Hindus agree upon *one universal definition of a Hindu*, and then it would be easy to answer the question whether a Jaina is a Hindu.

3. "To whom the Hindu Law applies"—This heresy has been attacked in almost all Jaina cases properly fought in our Law Courts. J. H. Nelson in his *Scientific Study of Hindu Law* 1881, at pp. 91-2, quotes Dr. Thomas as making a statement along the lines of history and Jaina tradition. The Doctor holds Buddhism to be an off-shoot of Jainism and proceeds. "It is sufficient to observe that the history of the Jaina religion, when constructed, must be prime importance to the student of Hindu Law, because it will show beyond all possibility of doubt that Jainists are not Hindus and cannot legally be subjected to the Hindu (*i. e.*, Samskrit) Law."

Further the assumption that Hindu Law applies to Jainas is absolutely illegal, as it is against statute law. (See 21 George III C. 70 S. 17; Sir William Jones on 19th March 1788 in *Digest of Hindu Law* by Colebrooke, in preface pp. v-vi.; 3J III C. 142; Sir M. E. Smith in 4 Calcutta (Indian Law Reports) at p. 751; 29 Allahabad (I. L. R. 495).

4. Jainas are "a well-known sub-division of the Vaishya caste."

Of course it is absurd. The Jaina books divide Jainas, into the 3 castes; and even to-day there are Brahman Jainas, Kshatriya Jainas, Vaishya Jainas in Southern India. A very old book *Lord's Display* 1630 says; Jaina priests of Surat are considered a part of the Brahman body, though Sudras by caste.

Most Jainas now may be called *Vaishya* by profession as they are mostly merchants, bankers, jewellers etc. But a Jaina, *i. e.*, a follower of the Jina, Tirthamkara, as such, is not a Vaishya.

Dr. Gour has erred in not distinguishing between caste and religion.

5. 5. "Which is divided into Agarwalas, Mahesris, Jains." —The Jainas are not all Vaishyas. But many Jains are Agarwalas, as indeed I am one myself. But I fear Dr. Gour's classification of Vaishyas is very wrong. It is illogical and confused as a matter of fact. The Vaishas are not only Agarwalas or Mahesris; and Jainas and Agarwalas are not exclusive classes. The fact is that Agarwalas may be Jainas or Vaishnavas; and not seldom there are intermarriages between them; *e.g.*, in Arrah, Benares, Muthra, and Meerut.

JL
813 M211, NOS
NOS-17

161126

6. "Agarwalas and Mahesris being orthodox Hindus,"—This is wrong. Some Agarwalas, at least, are Jainas and therefore strictly not Hindus at all, much less *orthodox* Hindus.

7. Jainas are "Hindu heretics."—This is a deeper painting of the libel "Jainas are Hindu dissenters" which I have dealt with above.

8. "Hostility between Svetambaras and Digambaras".—This is offensive and likely to cause disaffection between the two great brotherly sects of the same religion. The Dvaita and Advaita Schools of Vedant are not nearer or more harmonious and fraternal than Svetambara and Digambara Jainas. Specially so far as Law and their other secular rights and interests are concerned, the Svetambaras and Digambaras are entirely one. And whatever I am writing is on behalf of all of my Jaina brethren, Digambara, and Svetambara including the Sthankavasis.

9. "After the corpse is buried."—That a serious book of law by an eminent *Hindu* like Dr. Gour can contain such a howler passes my comprehension. Even an European boy of the age of discretion knows that Jainas, and even Hindus do not *bury* their dead, but cremate them.

10. "Her adoption is not controlled by the sacred texts."—This is worse than ignorance. This is a "terminological inexactitude" of huge dimensions. What else should control adoption by a widow except the texts of her sacred books? And are there learned people in India who imagine that the Jainas have no "sacred texts" of their own?

There are plenty of "sacred texts" of the Jainas; and a Jaina widow is bound by them quite as much as her Hindu sister is bound by the Hindu "sacred texts." Indeed Dr. Gour himself uses them on pp. 359-360 of his Code.

As a matter of fact, adoption is governed by verses 39 and the following, in *Bhadrabahu Samhita*,* and many other rules and injunctions in Jaina sacred books.

11-12. "She may adopt any one and of any age."—This is not quite correct. There are restrictions, written and unwritten. But they need not be gone into here.

* This is available in print and English translation from the Central Jaina Publishing Depot, Arrah. Its title is Jaina Law 1916.

13. "Jainism claims to be the precursor of Buddhism, but it is only its child."—It is too late in the day even to posit this thesis. It is more dead than the door nail. All kinds of up-to-date historical methods and evidences have proved just the contrary of the above. One does not expect a compiler of Law books to be a scholar, or even a student of ordinary history. But when a keen lawyer coolly defames *ex cathedra* a whole community of his Indian neighbours, he cannot be exempted from full responsibility. The proposition was not essential for a "Hindu Code" and it is highly censurable that such a grossly wrong statement should be made in a book of Law, which may be cited in a Court of Law, and will certainly be read by a considerable number of people.

This brief reply has already become too long and I can only refer Dr. Gour to the works of Drs. H. Jacobi, R. Hoernle, Guerinot, Barnett, L. Suali, Burgess, Buhler, Johannes Hoertel etc. etc., which will convince him of the cruel wrong he has done to his Jaina countrymen by the above wrong statement.

14. "Jainism is a compromise between Buddhism and Hinduism."—This is quite wrong. Indeed it is impossible, as has been shown already that Buddhism is an offshoot of Jainism, and Jainism is at least coeval with Hinduism. As Hinduism dates only after the Vedas in the days of Aryan settlements in the Punjab about 1000 B. C., and History teaches us the existence of the 23rd Jaina Tirthamkara Lord Parsva Nath in the 8th century B. C. in Behar, and his immediate predecessor Lord Neminath in Junagadh a few centuries before, therefore it is clear that Jainism is older than Hinduism also.

15-16. "New faith" "refuge in a creed."—Jainas were not the old Hindu receivers of the new creed of Gautama Buddha, but they were the tolerant spectators of the world going astray into the arms of relaxed Hinduism, and Buddhism away from the lofty though hard discipline of morality and restraint, which every teaching of Jainism enjoins on its follower, even in the lowest and earliest stages of a householder's life.

17-18. "Has borrowed from Buddhism its doctrines and religious practices."—As above, Buddhism is a borrower from Jainism. Among others for the edification of those who are obsessed by the shibboleth of Jainism being an offshoot of and borrower from Buddhism, I may inflict just one small technical point in favour of my theory that Buddhism is the borrower from

Jainism. One of the 7 principles (Tattvas) of Jainism is *Asrava.* It literally means Inflow; something flowing into someone. Now Jainas hold that absolutely invisible, almost atom-like, particles of karmic matter flow into the soul and bind it to its worldly existence. If they are of an auspicious nature, as when a man is moved by a thought of charity, forgiveness, humility, justice, unselfishness, truth, expiation etc. etc., the inflow or *asrava* is meritorious *punya.* Thoughts and deeds of a contrary kind give a demeritorious *papa asrava.* This is a natural and *first* rise of the term *asrava.* This is Jainism.

Now look at Buddhism. It has the term *asrava.* But what is its meaning? Simply sin or *papa.* Etymology is discarded; the two-fold and natural distinction between meritorious and demeritorious inflow is dropped and only the last half of the Jaina idea is borrowed, like a hastily and stealthily snatched away half of a blanket or shirt! Again, take the well-known Buddhist idea of *Nirvana* as extinction of the soul. What a crude and mangled remain it is of its original—the Jaina idea of Nirvana! The Jainas hold that a living being, *e.g.*, a man is a mixture of the living soul, which is pure bliss, power, knowledge and conation, and of non-living karmas which obscure and obstruct these 4 and infinite other qualities of the pure soul. When by the gradual and progressive discipline of a believer, the soul sheds its non-living vestment in its entirety, all its passions and imperfections disappear, *i e.*, the worldly entanglement of the soul is extinguished, and its full light revealed and illumined for ever. This is the grand Jaina idea of *Nirvana.* Buddhism borrowed it and fastened on only the idea of *extinction* in it without valuing properly its Jaina adjuncts which alone make it rich, lofty, logical and convincing.

Even he who runs may see now who is the borrower. Certainly not Jainism!

19. "The waning influence of Buddhism continued in Jainism."

It again savours of the Jainism an offshoot of Buddhism theory, which has been shown to be quite untenable.

20. "Jainism became eventually merged and practically lost in Hinduism."—Why is Hinduism so eager to claim Jainism as a part of its fold? Hinduism is vague, indefinite, diplomatic here and there. Jainism is always clear, definite and absolutely uncompromising with error. Its *dravyanuyoga* or philosophy is

marvellously complete and self-contained. It has got its own individuality and *it can never be* merged or lost in any creed new or old. As well claim to hold the waters of the globe in the hollow of the human hand as claim that nondescript confused Hinduism can absorb or swallow Jainism. It is impossible.

Every body in all the four corners of the globe is groaning against all the miseries, political, social, economic and of all kinds Many remedies are prescribed and tried. But only one can cure, and that always comes from Jainism. America saves herself from ruin by going dry: Jainism has taught the strictest abstinence from all intoxicants for thousands of years. India is to be led. M. Gandhi rises to lead it in a most difficult stage; he charms all hostility into silence, or inactivity. What makes him so harmless and so exempt from the hostility of all? His non-violence or *ahimsa*, which is the first step and a *sine qua non* of the life, thought, speech and action of all rational beings according to Jainism. Let the world read its riddle and misery in the light of the mere A. B. C. of Jainism in an unprejudiced attitude of sympathy and faith; and it will at once find the cleanest, clearest solution to its riddle and cure for its misery. Indeed, Jainism has the most perfect truth knowable and practisable by man; and unless the world with all its statesmen, kings, leaders and warriors comes to a deliberate sight, belief and acceptance of Jainism, the miseries of life, due to the uncurbed sway of the passions of anger, pride, deceit, greed and wrong selfish love and hatred, will run rampant and the world will never see peace, goodwill, prosperity and progress.

Let me not be misunderstood. The above is not a prophetic, proselytising attempt. I am too liberal and too weak for such a narrow and heroic task. There are points, rays of truth common to Jainism and the other religions etc., in the world, *e.g.*, non-injury, truth, non-stealing, chastity, simplicity are enjoined, I think, by all creeds and by the practice of all great men of all ages and countries. The world should come back to this. Thus it will be nearer the heart of Jainism. The distinction seems to be this. In other religions these things are sometimes taught as good morality etc. In Jainism they are always given as definite, unalterable, eternal formulae of mathematical exactness and ruthless cause and effect, beyond the hope of all extraneous forgiveness or exemption by anyone how high soever. As you sow, so

you reap. If you want to reap peace and prosperity, sow only these and not discord and greed for yourself, for the community, or country of your birth, or for the victory or supremacy of a party or creed with which you choose to identify yourself. Stand up for and stick to the truth and nothing can ultimately go wrong with you. So says Jainism, has said it in the past, and shall say it for ever and for ever more.

Peace to All !!!

J. L. JAINI.

Pramana-naya-tattvalokalamkara.

OF

Sri Vadideva Suri.

(Translated by Harishatya Bhattacharyya M.A., B.L.)

(Continued from page 279.)

Sutra 6.

That is *essentially* valid (or certain) as it is opposed to Samarupa or Superimposition,—or as it is the Pramana.

Commentary.

"That" refers to Knowledge, which is identical with the Pramana. The Pramana determines the natures of a thing as it really is and is opposed to the three forms of Samarupa or false knowledge, to be described later on,—*viz.*, Samsaya or Doubt, Biparyaya or Illusion and Anadhyavasaya or Inattention.

In this connection, the Commentator criticises the Buddhist theory of 'Nirvikalpa' or Pure Sensation. According to the Buddhists, there is such a phenomenon as Pure Sensation. It is just the result of the Object acting on an absolutely passive Subject and is as yet undetermined and unmodified by the processes of attention and apperception. According to the Buddhists, the Pratyaksha Pramana means just this Nirvikalpa or Pure Sensation.

The Jaina philosophers, however, reject the Buddhist theory of the Pratyaksha and deny that there can be any Nirvikalpa or undetermined Perception at all. According to the Buddhists, a Perception is either Sensuous Perception or Mental Perception or

Transcendental Perception or Perception due to Self-consciousness,—and the Jainas contend that none of these kinds of Perception can bring us face to face with the alleged Nirvikalpa. The Nirvikalpa is a psychosis, purest and most thoroughly undetermined, so that the Senses cannot touch it. Hence what we call Sensuous Perception cannot let us know the Nirvikalpa. The Internal or Mental Perception also cannot enable us to understand or feel Nirvikalpa for the simple reason that nothing can be a matter for Sensuous Perception. The third kind of Perception equally fails so far as the knowability of the Nirvikalpa is concerned. The Transcendental Perception, as the Buddhists mean, is the mysterious power of perceiving things, attained by a Sage. If it be contended that the Nirvikalpa is known through such a transcendental way of perceiving things, the Jaina may well argue that this proves nothing. For we are not Sages and are not consequently in a position to divine what they feel. Lastly, Self-consciousness also does not show what Nirvikalpa is. For immediately after we have a psychosis,—nay, along with it,—we have the consciousness of the Object, which causes that psychosis or of the Subject, which has it. We have never a psychosis, pure, simple and undetermined, which has not the consciousness of the Subject or of the Object, inseparably mixed up with it. Hence the Jaina contention is that there cannot be any such thing as Nirvikalpa or Pure Sensation. The unit of consciousness is always Savikalpa or a compound or complex Percept.

The Jaina philosophers further show that the Pure Sensation, as conceived by the Buddhists is not antagonistic to Samarupa *i.e.*, to Doubt, Illusion and Inattention. Hence it cannot be said to be valid knowledge *in essence* and accordingly it cannot be regarded as a Pramana.

The Buddhists, however, answer that the Jaina description of the Pramana is not quite accurate. According to them, the Pramana-hood consists in consistency. The Nirvikalpa,—which is the only form of the Pratyaksha Pramana; admitted by the Buddhists,—is consistent knowledge and is accordingly a Pramana. It is not valid knowledge *in essence* but it leads to valid knowledge. The Principle of Consistency permeates both Anumana and Pratyaksha (*i.e.*, Nirvikalpa) and makes them Pramanas. It does not matter that while Anumana is valid knowledge

in essence, Pratyaksha *leads to* it only; both are Pramanas, permeated as they are by the principle of Consistency.

The Jaina philosophers, on the other hand, urge that the Buddhists fail to show that the Nirvikalpa is Consistent Knowledge. To be consistent knowledge, knowledge must be Consistent with its Object, *i.e.*, must give a true and exact notion of the Object. The Nirvikalpa, however, according to the admission of the Buddhists, is free from all ideas about the Object. In fact, Consistent Knowledge and Valid Knowledge mean the same thing. Further,—the Nirvikalpa is not only not valid knowledge in itself, it cannot even be said to lead to it. For, as soon as any idea of the Object arises, the Nirvikalpa vanishes. Consistent Knowledge or Knowledge, Consistent with the nature of the Object, is never Nirvikalpa. It is always Savikalpa. The Nirvikalpa, by its nature is, as it were, an inert and inactive mass, which is incapable of moving towards the consciousness of the Object. It is not valid Knowledge; nor has it the power of moving towards it.

The Jaina position, thus, is, that the Nirvikalpa is no Pramana and that the Pramana is valid Knowledge *in essence.*

Sutra 7.

Samarupa or Superimposition consists in taking a thing for what it is not.

Commentary.

Knowledge consists in understanding the true nature of things. It is accordingly opposed to Ignorance which is *mis*-understanding it.

Sutra 8.

It is of three kinds,—*viz.*, Biparyaya or Illusion, Samsaya or Doubt and Anadhyavasaya or Inattention.

Commentary.

These are described below.

Sutra 9.

'Biparyaya' or Illusion consists in determining (a thing from) one aspect which is different (from the thing in its entirety).

Commentary.

This is illustrated below.

Sutra 10.

For instance: To regard oyster-shell as a piece of silver.

Commentary.

Another instance of Illusion is to see an yellow conch-shell.

The thinkers, however, of the school, founded by Prabhakara refuse to regard Illusion as altogether opposed to knowledge (Perception). According to them, even Illusion has an element of correct perception in it, although it is lost sight of. It is not proper to regard it as a form of false perception. "Hence both these psychical elements (which two compose the so-called Illusion,—'this' is 'Silver') are correct and faultless *viz.*,—'this,' the matter, supplied by Perception and *'Silver'*, the matter, supplied by Recollection; owing, however, to defective organs (*i.e.*, of Perception and Memory) the distinction between the element of Perception and the element of Recollection is not recognised; hence it may be called 'Bhedakhyati' or Non-recognition of Distinction." In other words, the Illusion,—'this is Silver'—contains an element of Perception (*'this'*) and an element of Recollection (*'Silver'*),—the correctness of which cannot be challenged. Hence, the psychosis 'this is Silver' is not a case of false knowledge. It is due to our failure to distinguish these two distinct elements and our proneness to mix up the two in one single psychosis. Accordingly the so-called Illusion is not a form of false knowledge but a case of Non recognition of Distinction.

The Jaina philosophers contend that the very argument of the school of Prabhakara shows that Illusion consists in false knowledge. It is false knowledge in this way. "What is *Silver* according to my Perception *is not* r ally *Silver.*" When an oyster-shell is before us, our knowledge should be 'it is an oyster-shell and not a piece of Silver'. In the example given, however, the Perception has been 'this is a piece of *Silver*'. This Perception is certainly *opposed to* true knowledge and is 'Biparyaya' or Illusion. The very argument that the elements of Perception and Recollection sink their distinction, shows that the matter of 'Biparyaya' cannot but be opposed to true knowledge.

Sutra 11.

'Samsaya' or Doubt consists in knowledge, touching the many aspects which remain undetermined owing to our not having at the time the supporting and the opposing reasons (for them).

Commentary.

When two or more possibilities crop up and we are not in a position to decide in one way or the other, we are said to be in a Doubting Mood. This is illustrated below.

Sutra 12.

For instance: What is that,—a Statue or a Man?

Commentary.

The example, given, is of Doubt with regard to a matter of Perception. An example of Doubt regarding a matter of Indirect Knowledge would be the questioning attitude ('What is that, a cow or a Galoy?') of a man who saw in a dense forest an animal with horns.

Sutra 13.

'Anadhyavasaya' or Inattention consists just in mentally asking,—What is it?'. 13.

Commentary.

Inattention is the attitude towards a thing which is just perceived and particulars about which are unperceived. Strictly speaking, it is not a mode of 'Samarupa' or Ignorance as it does not represent a thing differently from what it is.

Sutra 14.

For instance: The mental state of a man treading upon a blade of grass, while going on. 14.

Commentary.

A man while going on, treads upon a blade of grass. Being engaged in thoughts of other things, he does not understand at the time what kind of a thing it is or how long it is etc., etc, He simply perceives that something has come in contact with his foot. Inattention consists in this form of barest perception.

The example given above is of Inattention regarding a matter of Perception. Inattention with regard to a matter of Indirect knowledge may be illustrated in this way. A man does not know what a cow is; while travelling in a forest he comes across an animal with horns and wonders for a moment, 'What,—is there an animal here?' 'This is 'Anadhyavasaya' or Inattentive Mood with regard to a matter of '*Paroksha*' knowledge.

(*To be continued.*)

Why Washington Failed?

WHEN the Great War was being raged the Jainas of India helped the British Government in all possible ways with men and money. The unique contribution of a crore of rupees to the War loan by a single Jaina Sir Seth Hukumchand stands unrivalled. Every Jaina, may be supposed to have contributed his quota either by purse or prayer for the speedy and successful termination of the War. And all this why?

Apart from their unquestionable loyalty to the British throne the Jainas who are pre-eminently the best and foremost advocates of the theory of **Ahimsa**,—the theory of "Live and Let Live", or the policy of universal love and brotherhood—were sorely grieved to hear of thousands of fellow beings, whether allies or adversaries, whether Indians or Italians, English or French, Greek or German, hewn down to death in the mad frenzy of War. The harmless and innocent Jaina, who would not allow even a fly to be disturbed in its pleasant pursuit of humming and much less to be deprived of its life was very greatly shocked to hear of the ravages of War—of Cities burned to ashes, of men suffocated to death by poison gas, of machine guns, of submarines, of torpedoes, of dreadnoughts and tanks. He prayed night and day for the time when all these fatal and fateful limbs of the Monstrous War should be stiffened into inactivity, should be lying idle or in other words should be of no use.

This year when the Washington Conference proposed the Disarmament of big nations to a reasonable extent the heart of every Jaina jumped with joy at the expected result of the Conference *viz.*—the cessation of all Wars and the inauguration of an era of perpetual peace and prosperity. But Unfortunately for the World it would seem that such an expectation is very likely to prove a dream of dreams as may be easily judged from the proceedings of the Conference reported in the papers from day to day.

The Five Great Powers who have sent their delegates to Washington are all inclined to maintain their present fighting strength while the subject nations have no better political pros-

pects being left in the hands of one or other of these Big five. Regarding this point *The Modern Review* observes:—

"The Guiding principle of the Conference appears to be that the relative present fighting strength of the Independent nations is to be maintained. The mad race for bigger and bigger armaments is to be given up, mainly because the big nations feel the burden of taxation to be too heavy. At the same time, they will not allow other free nations to gradually acquire a fighting strength equal to theirs. The other peoples of the world are for ever to lie at the mercy of the Big Five. *Real equality and justice can result only either from the total disarmament of all nations*"* except what military equipment may be necessary for keeping internal peace and order or from the equal arming of all nations * * * So let the Big Powers either pursue their ideal, if they have any, to its logical conclusion, or let them cease to keep up the pretence that they are guided by any moral or spiritual ideal, frankly avowing that it is self-interest—lightening the military burden and the burden of Taxation, which is the impelling motive."

In the opinion of Dr. Herbert Adams Gibbons, "The first reason why the disarmament Conference is doomed to failure is the same as the first reason of the failure of the Versailles League of Nations. No Conference is international and can expect to make decisions which will be respected, which excludes Germany and Russia. This is not a matter for emotional hysteria or for the play of hatred or dislike or repugnance. It is a matter of common sense. Our opinion of Germany's role in the World War and what we think of Bolshevism do not make Germany and Russia any the less the two strongest countries in Europe."

Apart from these international questions of several powers not having been invited to the Conference, of some invited and allowed to "sit but not to speak" coupled with the fact that the motive of the Conference being mostly economic, the Conference may be said to be *not* truly *representative* and *Universal.* Every country must have been invited and allowed to send its own *elected* representative. Unless there is to be a Conference of this type no practical remedy can be sought for, for all the seething unrest among the dominion nations. Egypt is panting for

* The Italics are ours.

Independence, India strives for Swaraj or Dominion Home Rule within the Empire and Korea wants to free itself from the Yoke of Japanese task-masters. The whole world is now inhaling a new atmosphere of freedom—freedom the birth-right of all mankind.

But in all the proceedings there is not any evidence that the subject nations who are smarting under the bane of servility are to be given autonomy now or in the near future though, "Every speaker should be assumed to be giving vent to his sincere feelings unless there is obvious reason for making the opposite suggestion. So the remarks we are going to make are not meant to be personal so far as Mr. Harding is concerned. He may not harbour any fears or suspect any enemy but there are large numbers of Americans who suspect the Japanese and have fears of possible Japanese acts of aggression by way of peaceful penetration or otherwise. It is admitted that there is no considerable section of Americans which contemplates conquest. *"We have no sordid ends", "content with what we have we seek nothing which is another's." It is admitted that Americans have no territorial ambitions; but they want ever expanding Commerce in China—which may or may not be a sordid end and which may or may not be coveting what is another's. If Japan went on increasing her navy and her land forces, she would in course of time be able to monopolise the field of Commerce and industry in China, thus preventing America's Commercial expansion and even threatening her existing commerce in that country. May not this be one reason why America has taken the initiative in this conference ?"

The above extract from the editorial notes of *the Modern Review* very well elucidates one of the motives which would have actuated America to convene the conference. The American naval plan drawn by Mr. Hughes is this.

"One can assume from the statement that this provides for the immediate destruction of sixty-six Capital fighting ships aggregating 1.878,000 tons. Within three months after the agreement, the naval establishment of Great Britain would consist of 22 ships United States 18 Japan 10. Great Britain and the United States each 450,000 tons and Japan 270,000 tons. British

* Words from President Harding's inaugural speech at the Washington Conference.

and United States Submarine totals would each be 90,000 tons and Japan 48,000. No Government whose total tonnage exceeds the prescribed limit would be required to scrap excess until replacements were begun. Cruisers seventeen years old would be replaced by new constructions etc., etc.

But already notes of discord are evident. Among Britain's "friendly criticisms" are the following, "It is emphasised that the British Empire is a confederation of states widely separated and each Dominion has a big coast line requiring separate flottilla defences for which due allowance should be made.

"It is also pointed out that provision ought to be made against the possibility of a continental or even South American power making such a spurt as to necessitate scrapping the proposal for a three cornered limitation arrangement."

"British suggestions for the limitation of the size and tonnage of Submarines are apparently unacceptable to America in view of the fact that she would have to protect 65,000 Kilometers of coast with a heavily reduced fleet."

Japan would consent to only such limitations consistent with and "essential to her national security." Then China's minimum and justly self-respecting claims would not be at once accepted by Japan but however will be considered by her perhaps in due coarse.

As to France M. Briand declared that "France more than any other country was eager to turn her attention to the means of securing peace. Nevertheless he eloquently depicted the state of affairs which would ensure if France disarmed in face of a hostile Germany * * * He feared as long as the military party of General Ludendorff were preaching war as the Keystone of German policy every vigilance was necessary because Germany could raise six or seven million men within a few weeks."

Thus, therefore the failure of the proclaimed object of the Conference—the World peace—is generally felt by many nations though not by all.

In conclusion we pray to God that all the big powers of the world may not think of any more war at all and be armed only with the moral courage that their existence and rule are just and righteous. They provoke no enemy and they are not likely to have any. That weapons of warfare have ceased to be the only deciding factors of supremacy, that a Supreme Will, overrules

and overrides all man-made laws and resolutions and that even legions of deadly missiles cannot curb the spirit of one true man and much less the spirit of a nation may best be expressed in the words of Mac Swiney, "The single test, 'Tis the bravest test, the noble test, and this the test that offers the surest and greatest victory. For; one armed man cannot resist a multitude, nor one army conquer countless legions, but not all the empires of earth can crush *the spirit of a true man.**

POLITICUS.

Notes and News.

" What Central Europe Reads ".

UNDER the above heading, the *Literary Digest* brings together some information regarding the books most widely read in Germany. It thinks that "with Tagore a best seller in Germany one ought to look for a more peaceful frame of mind among the people of the new republic." Mr. Alfred Knopf, the New York bookseller, told a New York *Evening Post* interviewer that the Indian poet (Rabindranath Tagore) was "terrifically popular" in Germany. "Our paltry one or two hundred thousand for the most widely read popular novel is not to be mentioned alongside the record of the Indian Seer. Mr. Knopf says :—

> " When I was in Berlin, Tagore's Publisher placed an order for 1,000,000 Kilograms—more than 2,000,000 pounds—of paper for his books. That is enough for 3,000,000 volumes."—The Modern Review.

This is an ample evidence of the fact that the west in General—and Germany, the land of Goethe and Richer in particular have begun to seek for Solace and Salvation in Thoughts Oriental and Indian. Our readers are perhaps aware that no where else in the Western world that the Jaina philosophy and culture were better welcomed, studied and appreciated than in Germany. We understand that the Yale University of Germany is very busy editing and publishing standard works on Jaina philosophy, ethics and literature. In this connection we wish to record our indebtedness to *Jaina Dharsana Divakara* Prof. Hermann G. Jacobi for his noble and sincere efforts to translate

---

* The Italics are ours.

and edit in German such standard works of the Jains as the *Tattvartha Sutra* and *Acha-ranga Sutra.*

We hope that the Jains of India would wake up from their fatal slumber and bestir themselves in time and bring to the light of day the many master-pieces in several languages, on Jainism so that its divine message of Love and Brotherhood may spread broadcast and sober down the western nations into everlasting peace, law and order—an achievement which the Washington Conference failed to accomplish despite all the loud-long speeches of the representatives and the wide publicity given to them.

* * *

Famine in Russia.

We are not a little moved to read the following note about the ravaging Russian famine in the Modern Review,

"Months ago Dr. Nansen the Celebrated Arctic explorer appealed to Europe and America to come to the rescue of the millions of men, women and children dying of famine in Russia. The Allies, after wasting months in idle discussion, decided to call a Conference in Brussels. *The Independent* thus briefly describes the Conference, records its resolutions, quotes some observations of the *New Statesman* and adds a few of its own :—

"Nineteen Governments were represented at the Conference including Great Britain, France, the United States and Italy. The recommendations of the Conference were a disgrace to "civilisation." What they amounted to was this: the urgency of the need was recognized; it was admitted that the famine was too big to be fought by anybody other than the Governments of the world; but the Conference insisted on the acknowledgment of the debts of the Tsarist Government by the Soviet as a condition. The text of the resolution of the Conference in this matter runs as follows :—

> " The confidence necessary to secure the commercial and financial support of the commercial communities can only be created and maintained when Russia's debts and obligations have been recognized and all advances to her sufficiently guaranteed. These principles apply both to credits granted by the Governments and by private concerns.
>
> The Conference is thus led to the conclusion that in Order to obtain the credits for the purpose of aiding exportation to Russia the two following conditions are absolutely essential :—

(a) The Russian Government must recognise its existing debt and other obligations.

(b) Adequate guarantees must be given for all credits to be granted in the future."

This resolution was dissented from only by Italy. The resolution was agreed to by the Philp Lloyd-Graem on behalf of the British Government. It is not necessary to expound the clear implications of the attitude of the Governments of Europe. When the fate of five millions of human beings are hanging in the balance they insist upon the payment of the Tsar's blood-stained debt as the condition of their assistance.

Further comment is unnecessary.

* * *

We have much pleasure in according our congratulations to our Brother Nihal Karan Sethi, on his attaining the high Degree of a Doctor of Science. He is the first Jain who has obtained this rare distinction. It is a great pity that the Jains do not know, and what is worse do not think of, honoring their best men. They are so backward in education. Quite recently he has contributed a closely reasoned out articles to the pages of the Jain Hitaishe but we have not yet seen any appreciation thereof in any of the over-a-dozen periodicals possessed by Digambar Jains.

* * *

Elsewhere we publish a pointed criticism by Mr. J. L. Jaini, of Dr. H. S. Gour's Hindu Code wherein the doctor has committed serious mistakes in his references to Jainas and Jainism. We hope our readers both Jainas and non-jains would give it a careful perusal which it richly deserves.

The same article, in pamphlet form, can be had free of cost on application to the Seeretary, Jain Mitra Mandal, Delhi.

* * *

We thankfully acknowledge the receipt of a Gandhi letter pad of 100 sheets each. A half tone photo of Mahatma Gandhi adorns the left at the top of the letter paper whereas the saying "Vande Mataram" is found in three languages at the top of the letter paper. Everyway the pad is excellent and is bound to command a wide sale. The pad canbe hadfrom the Pictorial & Co. 41, Broadway Madras at 10 as. each.